

## **EXHIBIT A**

Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

New York Psychological Practice PC  
Virginia Boga, Ph.D.  
License # 020129  
979 Lamont Avenue  
Staten Island, NY 10309  
Office: 347-524-4169

## **COMPREHENSIVE PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION**

**Name of Client:** Johnson, Edward

**Date of Evaluation:** 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

**Date of Birth:** 08/11/2013

**Language of Evaluation:** English

### **TESTS ADMINISTERED:**

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children – Fifth Edition (WISC – V)

Wechsler Individual Achievement Test – Fourth Edition (WIAT – 4)

CELF – 5

Cambridge Assessments

Clinical Interview

Mental Status Examination

Review of Records

Clinician conducted a psychological evaluation for Edward Johnson. The clinical interview was conducted first to gather all the clinical data necessary. Then clinician conducted cognitive, academic, and social emotional testing. The assessment was done in-person.

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

Edward is 4<sup>th</sup> grade male student who attends P.S. 53. He has never had an IEP. Edward was referred by his neurologist Dr. Schwartzberg. Parent explained that the situation is very unusual. Edward was always a neurotypical child. He met all of his milestones. He always presented in an age-appropriate manner. His childhood was unremarkable until August of 2021. His pediatrician advised parent to visit a neurologist. Edward was bitten by a snake on his left-hand in August of 2021. The problem is Edward did not admit to the snake bite until February of 2022. He does have a scar on his left index digit. The fang of the snake is noticeable on the wound scar.

Parent explained the problem was she never noticed the scar until then. She did take him to the pediatrician as soon as she found out. He was given a tetanus shot immediately. They also

Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

took blood tests to assess for metabolic changes in his system, but everything was negative. By March or April of 2022 his grades went down dramatically. She explained he was an 80 to 85 student, and now he was getting 25s and 35s. He was experiencing nightmares of being bitten by a snake and would wake up. This led to Edward's mother taking him to the neurologist. The neurologist did a concentration test, EEG of brain and requested a psychological evaluation. They did not conduct an MRI. Parent also indicated she is on wait list for an appointment with an infectious disease specialist at Mt. Sinai.

Edward started therapy, but it did not last long. Parent did not find it very helpful. His grades continued to be poor. She also signed him up for basketball at Holy Child. He also did a lot of swimming. She got him a tutor in September 2022. She explained that socially, she feels he is normal. Parent described him as being very social. He has three siblings, and he is the youngest. He does have friends in school and goes to CCD and basketball.

Edward does not have a history of sensory issues. He does suffer from anxiety, but this started to happen after the snake bite. Edward's mother explained that her ex-husband is a snake dealer and breeder of both venomous and nonvenomous snakes. He has a license to breed snakes. Edward was allowed to grab one of the snakes. Her ex-husband denies this. Both Edward and her older son were present during the bite. They did not say anything until months had passed. Edward no longer has contact with his father after this incident.

Edward has been experiencing significant anxiety. He has nightmares of being bitten by a snake or snakes following him. When interviewing Edward, he discussed that in class he can't focus because he thinks a snake is going to pop out in the classroom. He reported he is very scared. Edward was containing this information for five months and then it finally came out. Edward reported that his father gave him a snake to hold. The tail got wrapped around the wrist and then the snake bit his left index digit and held on. It is reported that his father told him to swear and not tell his mother. This went untreated for months. His father took care of it in the home. Edward reported that their father put bandages to stop the bleeding. Since then, his father moved to Pennsylvania and has nothing to do with the children.

In discussing his symptoms, Edward reported having nightmares. His dreams include snakes chasing him, as well as being bitten on the hand. He also reported having flashbacks about a couple of times a week. He envisions a lot of snakes. When it happened, he was scared and did not feel safe. He indicated he is still scared that it will happen again. Edward's mother



Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

reported that prior to the bite everything was good. After he was bitten, he has become shy but only with adults. With his peers he is good.

Edward's mother is hoping that an assessment of Edward will help have a better understanding of his current functioning.

#### MENTAL STATUS AND BEHAVIORAL OBSERVATIONS:

Edward was assessed in-person. During the beginning of the assessment, clinician introduced herself to Edward. Prior to starting testing, clinician explained what we would be doing.

Edward was appropriately dressed and groomed and appeared his stated age. He was alert, and he was oriented to place, person, and date. Edward was a bit shy and anxious initially, but as session progressed, he did seem to feel much more comfortable with clinician. He presented in a sweet manner. Edward was able to focus throughout the assessment. Despite his anxiety and shyness, he was able to engage appropriately. Edward was cooperative throughout the assessment.

#### TEST RESULTS:

#### TEST SCORE ADDENDUM

##### PRIMARY SUMMARY

##### Composite Score Summary

Composite		Sum of Scaled Scores	Composite Score	Percentile Rank	95% Confidence Interval	Qualitative Description	SEM
Verbal Comprehension	VCI	23	108	70	100-115	Average	3.97
Visual Spatial	VSI	15	86	18	79-95	Low Average	4.50
Fluid Reasoning	FRI	13	79	8	73-88	Very Low	3.97
Working Memory	WMI	18	94	34	87-102	Average	4.24
Processing Speed	PSI	19	98	45	89-107	Average	5.41
Full Scale IQ	FSIQ	59	88	21	83-94	Low Average	3.00

Confidence intervals are calculated using the Standard Error of Estimation.

##### Subtest Score Summary

Domain	Subtest Name		Total Raw Score	Scaled Score	Percentile Rank	Age Equivalent	SEM
Verbal Comprehension	Similarities	SI	24	11	63	9:6	1.04
	Vocabulary	VC	26	12	75	10:2	1.08
	(Information)	IN	-	-	-	-	-
	(Comprehension)	CO	-	-	-	-	-
Visual Spatial	Block Design	BD	10	5	5	<6:2	1.24
	Visual Puzzles	VP	13	10	50	8:10	0.95
Fluid Reasoning	Matrix Reasoning	MR	11	5	5	6:2	1.08
	Figure Weights	FW	14	8	25	7:2	0.73
	(Picture Concepts)	PC	-	-	-	-	-

Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

	(Arithmetic)	AR	-	-	-	-	-
Working Memory	<b>Digit Span</b>	DS	22	9	37	8:6	0.99
	Picture Span	PS	24	9	37	8:6	1.08
	(Letter-Number Seq.)	LN	-	-	-	-	-
Processing Speed	<b>Coding</b>	CD	31	9	37	8:6	1.37
	Symbol Search	SS	20	10	50	8:10	1.34
	(Cancellation)	CA	-	-	-	-	-

Subtests used to derive the FSIQ are bolded. Secondary subtests are in parentheses.

## ABOUT WISC-V SCORES

Edward was administered 10 subtests from the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Fifth Edition (WISC-V). The WISC-V is an individually administered, comprehensive clinical instrument for assessing the intelligence of children ages 6:0-16:11. The primary and secondary subtests are on a scaled score metric with a mean of 10 and a standard deviation (*SD*) of 3. These subtest scores range from 1 to 19, with scores between 8 and 12 typically considered average. The primary subtest scores contribute to the primary index scores, which represent intellectual functioning in five cognitive areas: Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI), Visual Spatial Index (VSI), Fluid Reasoning Index (FRI), Working Memory Index (WMI), and the Processing Speed Index (PSI). This assessment also produces a Full-Scale IQ (FSIQ) composite score that represents general intellectual ability. The primary index scores and the FSIQ are on a standard score metric with a mean of 100 and an *SD* of 15. The primary index scores range from 45 to 155; the FSIQ ranges from 40 to 160. For both the primary index scores and the FSIQ, scores ranging from 90 to 109 are typically considered average.

Ancillary index scores are also provided. The ancillary index scores represent cognitive abilities using different primary and secondary subtest groupings than do the primary index scores. The ancillary index scores are also on a standard score metric with a mean of 100 and an *SD* of 15. The Verbal (Expanded Crystallized) Index (VECI), Expanded Fluid Index (EFI), Quantitative Reasoning Index (QRI), and Auditory Working Memory Index (AWMI) scores have a range of 45-155. The remaining three ancillary index scores have a range of 40-160: Nonverbal Index (NVI), General Ability Index (GAI), and the Cognitive Proficiency Index (CPI). Scores ranging from 90 to 109 are typically considered average. Further, the WISC-V provides complementary index scores that measure additional cognitive processes related to academic achievement and learning-related issues. The complementary index scores include the Naming Speed Index (NSI), Symbol Translation Index (STI), and the Storage and Retrieval



Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

Index (SRI). Both the complementary subtests and index scores are on a standard score metric with a mean of 100 and an *SD* of 15, with a range of 45-155. Scores ranging from 90 to 109 are typically considered average.

A percentile rank (PR) is provided for each reported composite and subtest score to show Edward's standing relative to other same-age children in the WISC-V normative sample. If the percentile rank for his Verbal Comprehension Index score is 70, for example, it means that he performed as well as or better than approximately 70% of children his age. This appears in the report as PR = 70.

## **INTERPRETATION OF WISC-V RESULTS**

### **FSIQ**

The FSIQ is derived from seven subtests and summarizes ability across a diverse set of cognitive functions. This score is typically considered the most representative indicator of general intellectual functioning. Subtests are drawn from five areas of cognitive ability: verbal comprehension, visual spatial, fluid reasoning, working memory, and processing speed. Edward's FSIQ score is in the Low Average range when compared to other children his age (FSIQ = 88, PR = 21, CI = 83-94). While the FSIQ provides a broad representation of cognitive ability, describing Edward's domain-specific performance allows for a more thorough understanding of his functioning in distinct areas.

### **Verbal Comprehension**

The Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI) measured Edward's ability to access and apply acquired word knowledge. Specifically, this score reflects his ability to verbalize meaningful concepts, think about verbal information, and express himself using words. Overall, Edward's performance on the VCI was typical for his age and emerged as a relative strength for Edward (VCI = 108, PR = 70, Average range, CI = 100-115; VCI > MIS, BR = <=5%). Additionally, his performance on verbal comprehension tasks was particularly strong when compared to his performance on tasks that involved processing and evaluating visual spatial information and using logic to solve problems (VCI > VSI, BR = 5.7%; VCI > FRI, BR = 2.2%). Edward's relative strength on language-based subtests suggests that he may understand information more easily when it is presented in a verbal, rather than visual, format. His performance indicates a relative strength in using verbal stimuli in problem solving compared to visual spatial problem solving. His pattern of performance also implies a strength in crystallized abilities relative to

Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

fluid reasoning abilities. Moreover, his performance on verbal comprehension tasks was stronger than his performance on tasks requiring him to mentally manipulate information ( $VCI > WMI$ ,  $BR = 11.9\%$ ).

With regard to individual subtests within the VCI, Similarities (SI) required Edward to describe a similarity between two words that represent a common object or concept, and Vocabulary (VC) required him to name depicted objects and/or define words that were read aloud. He performed comparably across both subtests, suggesting that his abstract reasoning skills and word knowledge are similarly developed at this time ( $SI = 11$ ;  $VC = 12$ ). His score on Vocabulary was above average, suggesting that he learns new words and is able to explain them easily. This was one of his strongest areas of performance when compared to his overall ability ( $VC = 12$ ;  $VC > MSS-P$ ,  $BR = \leq 10\%$ ). This represents a strength that can be built upon in his future development.

### **Visual Spatial**

The Visual Spatial Index (VSI) measured Edward's ability to evaluate visual details and understand visual spatial relationships in order to construct geometric designs from a model. This skill requires visual spatial reasoning, integration and synthesis of part-whole relationships, attentiveness to visual detail, and visual-motor integration. In this area, Edward exhibited performance that was slightly below other children his age ( $VSI = 86$ ,  $PR = 18$ , Low Average range,  $CI = 79-95$ ). Low scores in this area may occur due to deficits in spatial processing, difficulty with visual discrimination, poor visual attention, visuospatial integration deficits, or generally low reasoning ability. During this evaluation, Edward appeared to have some difficulty assembling block designs and puzzles in his mind, and his performance in this area was weak in relation to his performance on language-based tasks ( $VSI < VCI$ ,  $BR = 5.7\%$ ). Edward's relative weakness on visual spatial subtests during this evaluation suggests that his verbal problem-solving may be stronger than his visual spatial problem-solving. He may therefore benefit from additional support when presented with visual information.

The VSI is derived from two subtests. During Block Design (BD), Edward viewed a model and/or picture and used two-colored blocks to re-create the design. Visual Puzzles (VP) required him to view a completed puzzle and select three response options that together would reconstruct the puzzle. Edward showed inconsistent performance on these tasks. The discrepancy between Edward's scores on the Block Design and Visual Puzzles subtests is clinically



Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

meaningful. These subtests differ in the specific abilities involved, and consideration of the difference between the two scores informs interpretation of the VSI. While he showed average performance when assembling puzzle pieces in his mind (VP = 10), he showed greater difficulty using his hands to put together multicolored blocks to match pictures (BD = 5; BD < MSS-P, BR = <=5%; BD < VP, BR = 4.6%). This pattern of scores may indicate that his visuomotor skills may be a weakness relative to his overall visual-perceptual and spatial reasoning ability.

### **Fluid Reasoning**

The Fluid Reasoning Index (FRI) measured Edward's ability to detect the underlying conceptual relationship among visual objects and use reasoning to identify and apply rules. Identification and application of conceptual relationships in the FRI requires inductive and quantitative reasoning, broad visual intelligence, simultaneous processing, and abstract thinking. Edward's performance on the FRI was diverse, but overall was very weak for his age and was an area of relative weakness compared to his overall ability (FRI = 79, PR = 8, Very Low range, CI = 73-88; FRI < MIS, BR = <=10%). Low FRI scores may occur for a number of reasons including poor reasoning ability and difficulties with identifying important visual stimuli, linking visual information to abstract concepts, and understanding conceptual or quantitative concepts. His current performance evidenced difficulty with fluid reasoning tasks in relation to his performance on language-based tasks (FRI < VCI, BR = 2.2%). This pattern of strengths and weaknesses suggests that he may currently experience relative difficulty applying logical reasoning skills to visual information, but he may have relatively strong ability to verbalize meaningful concepts. His crystallized abilities are a strength compared to his fluid reasoning abilities. His fluid reasoning performance during this evaluation was also significantly lower than his performance on working memory and processing speed tasks (FRI < WMI, BR = 20.3%; FRI < PSI, BR = 21.9%). It may be that his ability to mentally manipulate and quickly evaluate visual information for decision making is superior to his complex problem-solving ability. Edward's relatively weak performance on the FRI suggests that he may currently experience some difficulty solving complex problems that require him to identify and apply rules.

The FRI is derived from two subtests: Matrix Reasoning (MR) and Figure Weights (FW). Matrix Reasoning required Edward to view an incomplete matrix or series and select the response option that completed the matrix or series. On Figure Weights, he viewed a scale with a missing weight(s) and identified the response option that would keep the scale balanced. Edward



Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

demonstrated diverse performance on these two tasks. While he showed age-appropriate performance when balancing scales under a time constraint (FW = 8), he showed greater difficulty identifying the missing pieces of patterns (MR = 5; MR < MSS-P, BR = <=5%; MR < FW, BR = 20.8%). This pattern of scores suggests that quantitative reasoning is a strength relative to inductive reasoning. It is possible that Edward may be better able to demonstrate his fluid reasoning abilities when mathematical reasoning is involved.

### **Working Memory**

The Working Memory Index (WMI) measured Edward's ability to register, maintain, and manipulate visual and auditory information in conscious awareness, which requires attention and concentration, as well as visual and auditory discrimination. Edward's performance on the WMI was similar to other children his age (WMI = 94, PR = 34, Average range, CI = 87-102). Edward recalled and sequenced series of pictures and lists of numbers at a level that was average for his age. His performance on these tasks was a relative strength when compared to his performance on logical reasoning tasks (WMI > FRI, BR = 20.3%). Edward's ability to mentally manipulate information is more developed than his ability to solve complex problems. While performance on working memory tasks was stronger than some cognitive abilities and average compared to peers, it was also weaker than other cognitive skills. Working memory performance was relatively low compared to his performance on language-based tasks (WMI < VCI, BR = 11.9%).

Within the WMI, Picture Span (PS) required Edward to memorize one or more pictures presented on a stimulus page and then identify the correct pictures (in sequential order, if possible) from options on a response page. On Digit Span (DS), he listened to sequences of numbers read aloud and recalled them in the same order, reverse order, and ascending order. He performed similarly across these two subtests, suggesting that his visual and auditory working memory are similarly developed or that he verbally mediated the visual information on Picture Span (PS = 9; DS = 9).

### **Processing Speed**

The Processing Speed Index (PSI) measured Edward's speed and accuracy of visual identification, decision making, and decision implementation. Performance on the PSI is related to visual scanning, visual discrimination, short-term visual memory, visuomotor coordination, and concentration. The PSI assessed his ability to rapidly identify, register, and implement

Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

decisions about visual stimuli. His overall processing speed performance was typical for his age (PSI = 98, PR = 45, Average range, CI = 89-107). Edward's processing speed performance was stronger than performance on tasks requiring him to use logic-based reasoning (PSI > FRI, BR = 21.9%).

The PSI is derived from two timed subtests. Symbol Search required Edward to scan a group of symbols and indicate if the target symbol was present. On Coding, he used a key to copy symbols that corresponded with numbers. Performance across these tasks was similar, suggesting that Edward's associative memory, graphomotor speed, and visual scanning ability are similarly developed (SS = 10; CD = 9).

### **ANCILLARY INDEX SCORES**

In addition to the index scores described above, Edward was administered subtests contributing to several ancillary index scores. Ancillary index scores do not replace the FSIQ and primary index scores but are meant to provide additional information about Edward's cognitive profile.

#### **Nonverbal**

The Nonverbal Index (NVI) is derived from six subtests that do not require verbal responses. This index score can provide a measure of general intellectual functioning that minimizes expressive language demands for children with special circumstances or clinical needs. Subtests that contribute to the NVI are drawn from four of the five primary cognitive domains (i.e., Visual Spatial, Fluid Reasoning, Working Memory, and Processing Speed). Edward's performance on the NVI fell in the Low Average range when compared to other children his age (NVI = 83, PR = 13, CI = 78-90). Low scores in this area may occur for many reasons including slow processing speed, poor working memory, abstract and conceptual reasoning difficulties, weak spatial reasoning skills, or low general intellectual ability. Assessment of Edward's performance on the NVI may help to estimate his overall nonverbal cognitive ability.

#### **General Ability**

Edward was administered the five subtests comprising the General Ability Index (GAI), an ancillary index score that provides an estimate of general intelligence that is less impacted by working memory and processing speed, relative to the FSIQ. The GAI consists of subtests from the verbal comprehension, visual spatial, and fluid reasoning domains. Overall, this index score



Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

was slightly below other children his age (GAI = 87, PR = 19, Low Average range, CI = 82-93).

Low GAI scores may occur for a number of reasons, including poor reasoning skills, visual spatial processing difficulties, language deficits, or generally low intellectual ability. Edward's FSIQ and GAI scores were not significantly different, indicating that reducing the impact of working memory and processing speed resulted in little or no difference on his overall performance.

### Cognitive Proficiency

Edward was also administered subtests that contribute to the Cognitive Proficiency Index (CPI). These four subtests are drawn from the working memory and processing speed domains. His index score suggests that he demonstrates average efficiency when processing cognitive information in the service of learning, problem solving, and higher-order reasoning (CPI = 94, PR = 34, Average range, CI = 87-102). Edward's GAI and CPI scores were relatively similar, suggesting that general ability is commensurate with cognitive proficiency.

### ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT:

#### WECHSLER INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVEMENT TEST – 4 (WIAT – 4)

The Wechsler Individual Achievement Test – Fourth Edition (WIAT – 4) is a standardized, individually administered and nationally normed clinical instrument designed to measure the achievement of students who are in grades Pre-kindergarten through 12. The WIAT-4 consists of various subtests used to evaluate listening, speaking, and reading, writing, and mathematics skills. Not all subtests are given for each age group; please refer to subtest names in the table below for subtests administered based on students' current age or grade.

#### Core Composite Score Summary

Composite/Subtest	Raw score	Standard score	95% Confidence interval	Percentile rank	Descriptive category	Age equivalent	Grade equivalent	GSV
<b>Total Achievement</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Word Reading	55	79	75 - 83	8	Very low	7:2	1.7	466
Reading Comprehension	22 <sup>2,3</sup>	81	72 - 90	10	Low average	7:2	2.0	476
Spelling	15	87	81 - 93	19	Low average	7:6	2.3	479
Essay Composition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Math Problem Solving	37	87	78 - 96	19	Low average	7:10	2.5	492
Numerical Operations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Reading</b>	160	78	71 - 85	7	Very low	-	-	-
Word Reading	55	79	75 - 83	8	Very low	7:2	1.7	466
Reading Comprehension	22 <sup>2,3</sup>	81	72 - 90	10	Low average	7:2	2.0	476
<b>Written Expression</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

Spelling	15	87	81 - 93	19	Low average	7:6	2.3	479
Sentence Composition	*	71	60 - 82	3	Very low	6:8	1.3	-
Essay Composition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Mathematics</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Math Problem Solving	37	87	78 - 96	19	Low average	7:10	2.5	492
Numerical Operations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

\* Indicates a subtest with multiple raw scores (shown in the Subtest Component Score Summary).

1 For composites, Raw score refers to Sum of Subtest Standard Scores.

2 Indicates a raw score that is converted to a weighted raw score (not shown).

3 Indicates that a raw score is based on a below-grade-level item set.

### Supplemental Composite Score Summary

Composite/Subtest	Raw score <sup>1</sup>	Standard score	95% Confidence interval	Percentile rank	Descriptive category	Age equivalent	Grade equivalent	GSV
<b>Basic Reading</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pseudoword Decoding	4	73	68 - 78	4	Very low	<6:2	<1.0	467
Phonemic Proficiency	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Word Reading	55	79	75 - 83	8	Very low	7:2	1.7	466
<b>Decoding</b>	152	76	72 - 80	5	Very low	-	-	-
Pseudoword Decoding	4	73	68 - 78	4	Very low	<6:2	<1.0	467
Word Reading	55	79	75 - 83	8	Very low	7:2	1.7	466
<b>Reading Fluency</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oral Reading Fluency	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orthographic Fluency	11 <sup>2</sup>	77	66 - 88	6	Very low	6:10	1.5	481
Decoding Fluency	4	79	67 - 91	8	Very low	<8:2	<3.0	458
<b>Math Fluency</b>	298	100	94 - 106	50	Average	-	-	-
Math Fluency--Addition	24	100	89 - 111	50	Average	9:2	3.9	522
Math Fluency--Subtraction	18	100	89 - 111	50	Average	9:2	3.7	519
Math Fluency--Multiplication	13	98	89 - 107	45	Average	8:10	3.7	507
<b>Phonological Processing</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pseudoword Decoding	4	73	68 - 78	4	Very low	<6:2	<1.0	467
Phonemic Proficiency	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Orthographic Processing</b>	164	80	74 - 86	9	Low average	-	-	-
Orthographic Fluency	11 <sup>2</sup>	77	66 - 88	6	Very low	6:10	1.5	481
Spelling	15	87	81 - 93	19	Low average	7:6	2.3	479
<b>Dyslexia Index</b>	229	75	71 - 79	5	Very low	-	-	-
Word Reading	55	79	75 - 83	8	Very low	7:2	1.7	466
Pseudoword Decoding	4	73	68 - 78	4	Very low	<6:2	<1.0	467
Orthographic Fluency	11 <sup>2</sup>	77	66 - 88	6	Very low	6:10	1.5	481

1 For composites, Raw score refers to Sum of Subtest Standard Scores.

2 Indicates a raw score that is converted to a weighted raw score (not shown).

Edward presented with significant difficulties on some of his academics. Below each domain will be examined to have a better understanding of his abilities.



Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

Regarding his **reading skills**, Edward exhibited delays. He struggled with reading words. He presented with a much lower vocabulary than expected for a child his age. He scored within the end of first grade. He also exhibited significant difficulties on sounding out fake words. It was very difficult for him. His reading comprehension was his highest score within the reading, but it still was delayed. He was not able to comprehend what he read because he can't read many words within the passages. His Dyslexia Index score was Very Low. He scored within the first-grade level on all subtests that measure Dyslexia. It is very clear that the deficits he presented regarding reading were not consistent with his cognitive abilities.

The **written language** cluster is a combination of *Spelling* (spelling a list of words) and *Written Expression* (writing sentences and paragraphs). These tests measure overall writing ability. Within this domain, Edward presented significant delays. His spelling was very poor. It was very difficult for him to spell out words. For instance, he was asked to spell "happily," and he wrote "haply." He was asked to write "known," and wrote "none." He also was asked to spell "camped," and wrote "campty." When asked to write sentences, this was even harder. For example, he was asked to write a sentence with the word "and." He wrote, "I like this plays and it is coler full" He did not use punctuation as well. His writing skills were very delayed as well.

The **mathematics composite** is a combination of *Numerical Operations* (solving math problems involving basic skills, basic operations with integers, geometry, algebra, and calculus) and *Math Problem Solving* (basic skills including counting and identifying shapes, everyday applications including time, money, and word problems, and geometry, and algebra). These tests measure a student's ability to perform basic math calculations and to use math skills in applied problems. Math was a strength for Edward. He performed well on math fluency skills. He was able to do addition, subtraction, and multiplication problems without any difficulties. He could not do as many as expected for a student his age. These are timed tasks, but he was able to do them accurately. On math problem solving skills he scored a bit below grade level. This in part could be because he is not focusing and struggles learning in class due to his constant worries of being bitten by a snake.

#### Screening Questionnaires:

In order to complete this assessment, clinician reviewed screenings completed by teachers. Teachers were asked to complete the CELF – 5.

Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

Based on the CELF-5 screenings from teachers, it is indicated by his teachers, that Edward has struggle with his expressive language skills. He has trouble finding the right words. He has trouble putting events in the right order. It is also reported he has trouble sounding out words. He struggles with understanding what he reads. Edward uses poor grammar when writing and has trouble completing sentences. These difficulties were all consistent with what was noted during the assessment.

It was also reported by a couple of his teachers that he does struggle with his attention skills. It is reported that he is unorganized and often forgets things he needs for class and/or to take home. He tends to need a checklist even when it is announced what needs to be taken.

#### **Cambridge Science Assessments**

Edward's visual spatial skills, working memory, verbal reasoning, verbal-short term memory, attention, and response inhibition were assessed via Cambridge Software. Edward had to complete a certain number of tasks online. Edward presented with some variability.

On Monkey Ladder, a task that measures visual spatial working memory – the ability to remember information about objects in space and update memory based on changing circumstances, Edward did well. He scored within the 61<sup>st</sup> percentile. This was one of his strengths. This assesses his ability to follow step by step instructions or drawing something after seeing step by step directions on how to draw it. On another task, Spatial Span a measure of spatial short-term memory, he scored within the 42<sup>nd</sup> percentile. On Token Search, which assesses working memory he scored within the 54<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Edward performed similarly on Paired Associates, a task that assesses for episodic memory. He scored within the 53<sup>rd</sup> percentile. On Rotations he exhibited some difficulties, he scored within the 33<sup>rd</sup> percentile. This task measured the ability to rotate visual representations of objects, which requires the ability to reason what the objects are, where they are at, and where they belong. He performed relatively alright on Odd One Out, which is a task about deductive reasoning. This measures the ability to effectively apply rules to information and arrive at logical conclusions. He scored within the 44<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Edward did outstandingly well on Digit Span. A measure of short-term memory. He scored within the 65<sup>th</sup> percentile. He did even better on Feature Match, which measures of attention. He scored within the 77<sup>th</sup> percentile.



Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

Edward did present with some weaknesses. Spatial Planning was one of his weakest areas. This is a task that measures planning. The ability to act with forethought and prepare a sequence of steps to reach a goal. He scored within the 8<sup>th</sup> percentile. He also struggled with grammatical reasoning which measures verbal reasoning. He scored within the 19<sup>th</sup> percentile. She also did very well on Digit Span, which is consistent with her scores on Digit Span on the IQ test. Finally, on Double Trouble a task that assessed response inhibition, he scored within the 7<sup>th</sup> percentile.

**Review of Records:**

In conducting this assessment, clinician reviewed report from the neurologist. It is reported by neurologist's report that he should have a full psychological assessment to rule out ADHD and any other learning disabilities.

**Summary and Implications:**

Edward is a nine-year-old, male student who is in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade. He was referred by his mother for cognitive, social emotional, and academic achievement testing. His mother is concerned about the significant change Edward has presented in the last year. Edward was bitten by a snake and since then his academics have declined dramatically.

The WISC-V was used to assess Edward's performance across five areas of cognitive ability. As measured by the WISC-V, his overall FSIQ score fell in the Low Average range when compared to other children his age (FSIQ = 88). The language skills assessed appear to be one of Edward's strongest areas of functioning. He showed age-appropriate performance on the Verbal Comprehension Index (VCI = 108). Performance on verbal comprehension tasks was particularly strong compared to his performance on visual spatial (VSI = 86) and working memory (WMI = 94) tasks. He performed variably across fluid reasoning tasks during this evaluation. His scores on the FRI demonstrate that overall, this was one of his weakest areas of performance (FRI = 79). Performance on fluid reasoning tasks was an area of personal weakness when compared to his performance on working memory (WMI = 94) and processing speed (PSI = 98) tasks.

Ancillary index scores revealed additional information about Edward's cognitive abilities using unique subtest groupings to better interpret clinical needs. On the Nonverbal Index (NVI), a measure of general intellectual ability that minimizes expressive language demands, his performance was Low Average for his age (NVI = 83). He scored in the Low Average range on

Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

the General Ability Index (GAI), which provides an estimate of general intellectual ability that is less reliant on working memory and processing speed relative to the FSIQ (GAI = 87). Edward's typical performance on the Cognitive Proficiency Index (CPI) suggests that he exhibits average efficiency when processing cognitive information in the service of learning, problem solving, and higher order reasoning (CPI = 94). Potential areas for intervention are described in the following section.

Clinician would like to point out that based on this cognitive assessment, it is clear that Edward is a bright boy, but he does have some deficits in the nonverbal skills. His language skills are better developed than his nonverbal abilities.

Clinician conducted the WIAT – 4, which indicated Edward has significant deficits. His reading and writing abilities were significantly delayed. He presented with very poor reading and writing skills. Edward struggles with sounding out words. It is difficult for him to understand what he reads due to the fact he can't read many words. It is difficult for him to spell as well. These difficulties are not consistent with his language skills within the cognitive assessment. His math skills were a strength. He did relatively well on his math fluency abilities. These are timed tasks. He did not make any mistakes but could not do as many as expected for a student his age.

Regarding, social skills, Edward presented as a sweet but shy and anxious child. Edward has been experiencing heightened anxiety after a snake bite he experienced a year ago. Edward reports having flashbacks and nightmares all connected to the snake bite. He is struggling with focusing due to his symptoms related to his trauma. When he is in the classroom he struggles with paying attention because he envisions snakes popping out of everywhere.

Based on this clinical interview, screenings, and testing, below are the diagnoses Edward met full criteria for:

DSM – V

1. Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (ICD – 10 = F43.1)
2. Specific Reading Disorder (ICD – 10 = F81.0)
3. Disorder of Written Expression (ICD – 10 = F81.81)

\* Once Edward has received treatment for PTSD, he should be reassessed for ADHD. He presents with symptoms of ADHD but given previous clinical history that he did not have a history, it is most likely that the symptoms are related to PTSD and not ADHD.

### **Recommendations:**



Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

Based on the findings of this evaluation, it should be noted that Edward is a smart boy, who exhibits significant anxiety and attention issues, which appear to be connected to trauma. He also does present with academic deficits, which are connected to learning disabilities.

Below are detailed recommendations that would help Edward reach his fullest potential.

- ❖ It is recommended for Edward to receive 10 hours of SETSS:
  - Edward should receive 5 hours of SETSS in school, provided by an Orton Gillingham certified provider.
  - Edward should receive 5 hours of SETSS out of school by an Orton Gillingham provider.
- ❖ Edward should receive counseling from a doctoral level therapist who specializes in trauma. This will help Edward work on his anxiety, hypervigilance, flashbacks, and nightmares. Edward needs to work through the trauma of the snake bite but also the fact that he had to withhold this information for so long and go untreated.
- ❖ Edward should receive counseling in school at least once a week so that he could have the support of a clinician in school.
- ❖ It is recommended for Edward to receive an Assistive Technology assessment. Edward presents with significant reading and writing deficits due to his learning disabilities. It would be helpful to have an evaluation to determine the appropriate programs and apps that could be best utilized. This evaluator suggests a talk to text, and a text to talk so Edward can read his worksheets and can read his own writing. This can help him to be able to hear what he actually wrote. He should have a graphic organizing program; it should have scanning capacities and a thesaurus to assist him to understand higher and deeper level of words. It should also be considered for Edward to use a computer as well.
- ❖ It is recommended for Edward to have Testing Accommodations
  - Edward should have time and a half for tests and projects given his difficulty focusing, paired with his reading, and writing learning disabilities.
  - It is recommended for Edward to receive preferential seating. He should sit next to a strong peer.
  - If school does not use a google classroom, or a pupil path type of program where parents have access to assignments, Edward should then receive a copy of the homework assignments at the end of each day.

Child's Name: Johnson, Edward

D.O.B. 08/11/2013

D.O.E.: 10/18/2022; 10/22/2022; 10/28/2022

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'VB', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Virginia Boga, Ph.D.

NYS Licensed Psychologist, # 020129